

PART II -- MAIN EDITION -- 1 NOVEMBER 1983

## INTELLIGENCE...Cont.

"Circumstances surrounding this week's events in the Caribbean have damaged, perhaps irreparably, that credibility," Mr. Janka said of his own reputation in a letter to the President dated Oct. 28.

Some White House sources, however, suggested that Mr. Janka's departure had been requested by White House officials. The reasons for such a request varied, according to the source.

Mr. Reagan's chief spokesman, Larry Speakes, said today that the Administration does not have a credibility problem, adding that in combat situations it was difficult to collect and disseminate news quickly.

Although lawmakers and reporters are seeking evidence supporting the Administration's claims, Mr. Speakes and other officials say that evidence will not be made public until it has been analyzed. Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth W. Dam, for example, said Sunday, "It takes a little while to go through all those weapons and all those documents."

Saying that invading forces found "a treasure trove of documents" in Grenada, Mr. Dam said that the papers were being analyzed "because we don't want to misrepresent what they show."

Last week, however, when the Administration first cited the Soviet and Cuban role in Grenada as one reason for the invasion, Administration officials did not indicate that the assertion was based on only a partial analysis of intelligence information. Mr. Reagan, in a speech on Thursday, said that Grenada was a "Soviet-Cuban colony being readied" to export terrorism. He said the American invasion had prevented a planned "Cuban occupation of the island."

Administration officials said later that Mr. Reagan's conclusions were supported by discoveries in Grenada of large stockpiles of Soviet and Cuban arms, secret documents showing that Cuba planned to send hundreds of additional troops to Grenada, and 18,000 stored military uniforms.

## Conclusions Challenged

Some of the conclusions have been challenged by members of Congress. Democrat and Republican members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence said after a briefing about Grenada last week that information from the island about Soviet and Cuban activities was too limited to support broad judgments.

Reporters who visited warehouses that the Administration said were filled with Soviet and Cuban weapons found significant stockpiles of Soviet arms but also a number of antiquated guns, including rifles manufactured in the 1870's.

A senior Defense Department official said today that the Pentagon was preparing a list of the Soviet and Cuban arms found in Grenada and will make it public as soon as possible. "I wouldn't predict when that will be," he added.

WASHINGTON TIMES 1 NOVEMBER 1983 Pg. 1B

# Daniel Graham: Sheriff of the 'High Frontier'

By Tom Nugent  
WASHINGTON TIMES STAFF

He's a retired U.S. Army general. He's the former chief of the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency. And he's the controversial creator of "High Frontier" — a Washington-based public interest group which hopes to end the threat of nuclear war by placing non-nuclear weapons in outer space.

A rather imposing background, you would think at first.

But if you want to understand Dan Graham, *really* understand Dan Graham, then you have to start someplace else.

You have to start, as a matter of fact, with his grandfather's handlebar mustache.

"POW!"

You have to start with the former three-star general, now 58 years old, sitting in his downtown Washington office and pounding his right fist into his left palm: "POW!"

And then he laughs out loud. "My maternal grandfather," says Daniel Orrin Graham, remembering his boyhood days in the cabin on Puget Sound, "was the sheriff of Josephine County, out there in southern Oregon. And he was a character out of a Wild West novel. A ten-gallon hat, a big handlebar mustache, chaps and a horse... and he was the law in Josephine County!"

Joe Russell. His picture hangs on the wall of the county courthouse, even today. Sitting on his horse, and glaring. And you knew that you didn't want

to get crosswise of the law...

"Well, I lived with him for a couple of years. I was just a kid. And one day I walked into that cabin... I'd just gotten into a fist fight with a half-breed [Indian] kid named Sonny Thompson, and he was a lot tougher than I was, and he thrashed me!"

He laughs again here. It's a raspy sound, since he smokes all the time, like a saw going through dried lumber. "HAARRGGHH!" and yessir, he's having a good time, this three-star American general, remembering the pounding he once took. "Well," recounts Graham, "I came in pretty well banged-up, and bawling. And I had the misfortune to run into my grandfather, instead of my grandmother. And he said: 'You been in a fight?'"

"I said, 'Yeah.'"

"Did you get whipped?"

"I said yes — and he knocked me clear across the cabin!"

Now the general leans into threatening crouch; now his voice rumbles ominously as he imitates the mustachioed county sheriff at high noon: "He said, 'Was there not a rock [nearby]? Was there not a stick?'"

"YOU DON'T GET WHIPPED!"

"Well, from then on, whenever I came back to that cabin... no matter what kind of dust-up I'd gotten into, I would say to him: 'You should see the other kid!'"

"HAARRGGHH!"

...

He never forgot that lesson.

Almost 50 years after the sheriff knocked him across the Oregon cabin for "getting whipped," Dan Graham sits in his office in downtown Washington and argues that

GRAHAM...Pg. 4-F

STAT

## PART II -- MAIN EDITION -- 1 NOVEMBER 1983

GRAHAM...Continued

the United States cannot afford to be defeated in the race to build a strong military defense in outer space.

But he wants you to be very, very careful about this matter: He does not want to be misunderstood.

Dan Graham believes that the United States should build a weapons system in space in order to prevent a nuclear war — not in order to win one.

And why does the controversial defense expert believe this? Well, for starters, Graham's 20 years as an analyst of military intelligence (including stints with the CIA, Defense Intelligence Agency and Army Intelligence) have convinced him that the world now stands in grave peril because of the rapidly accelerating spread of nuclear weapons.

"The situation today," says the former lieutenant general, explaining how he got interested in anti-missile technology soon after retiring from the Army in 1976, "resembles the classic scene from a Western movie, where two guys are facing each other down on Main Street, and each seeing whether the other guy goes for his gun.

"And both sides know perfectly well that the guy who gets his nuclear six-gun out of the holster, and fires first, has got by far the better chance of survival."

He speaks quite softly now. A show-haired, blue-eyed, rather diminutive fellow (at just a shade under 5-feet-6, he barely managed to qualify for West Point) whose thin, gold-rimmed spectacles suggest the library rather than the battlefield, Dan Graham understands that when it comes to discussing the modern world's most terrible problem — the ever-present threat of nuclear annihilation — there is no need to shout.

"That's our current strategic situation," he calmly continues, "and it gets worse all the time, because the holster gets slicker, and the guys are getting faster and faster on the draw . . .

"So what you have to do is to get out of the situation where you've got two guys facing each other down on Main Street. And that's why the defensive schemes that we're talking about on High Frontier are absolutely critical.

"Because technology has made it possible now to react fast enough to catch the bullet. To stop the war — and thereby prevent it . . . And it turned out that the best way to do this is with a non-nuclear, space-borne defense [system] against the most crucial threat to us, which is the long-range, ballistic missile.

"And that's how High Frontier got going."

\*\*\*

His basic proposal, which has been derided by some analysts as a "Star Wars" approach to national defense but praised by others as a sane substitute for the "MAD" ("Mutual Assured Destruction") doctrine upon which the U.S.-Soviet nuclear weapons standoff has thus far been based, amounts to this:

Let us immediately begin constructing, urges Dan Graham, a three-layered, space-based, non-nuclear defense system (at a total cost of perhaps \$30 billion, over the next few decades) designed to end forever the nuclear "balance of terror."

Let us immediately begin to develop, proposes the former DIA Soviet expert, a computer-linked satellite system that would be capable of knocking down 97 percent of all the nuclear missiles that any enemy could ever throw against us.

With such a system in place, according to Graham, the U.S. would be virtually invulnerable to most nuclear weapons, thus eliminating both the danger of an enemy first strike and the danger of a catastrophic nuclear "accident."

Describing the several years of research which have already gone into his proposed system, Graham writes in a new book on the subject: "The High Frontier team determined that this advantage [superior U.S. space technology] could best be exploited by providing a layered strategic defense to nullify the Soviet threat of a first strike.

"Somewhat to our surprise, we found that an effective spaceborne defense could be had in five to six years using off-the-shelf technology and that emerging technology could greatly strengthen the first layer of strategic defense in ten to 12 years."

While High Frontier's proposals now enjoy considerable support among congressional, White House and Department of Defense analysts, some of Dan Graham's opponents insist that the space-based system simply won't work.

Rep. Edward Markey, for instance, a liberal Democrat from Massachusetts and the chief advocate of the recent "nuclear freeze" movement in the House, has described the space-based strategy as an unrealistic "fantasy," and compared it to the popular science fiction film, "Star Wars." ("The force of evil," says Markey in a recent speech, "is the Soviet Union — and they are Darth Vader. We are Luke Skywalker and we are the force of good.")

Other critics of the High Frontier plan, meanwhile, point out that two international treaties (one drawn up by the United Nations,

and the other a product of the U.S.-Soviet SALT I negotiations) specifically prohibit the use of defensive weapons in outer space.

In addition, some of Graham's critics insist that the development of such weapons would only escalate the nuclear arms race, by forcing the Russians to invent a new and more terrible generation of offensive weapons. ("I don't see any way that a defensive arms race would terminate an offensive arms race," argues David C. Morrison, a research analyst for the Center for Defense Information, a Washington-based public interest group which advocates the "nuclear freeze." "Rather, both superpowers would simply devise new means of attacking each other's homelands.")

While other critics, including some Defense Department analysts, have also suggested that the ultimate cost of building High Frontier might ultimately be far higher than the \$30 billion to \$35 billion proposed by Graham, at least a score of nationally prominent figures in the political, military and scientific communities (including, among others, former Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral Thomas Moorer, atomic scientist Edward Teller, astronaut Buzz Aldrin and science fiction writer Robert Heinlein) have been equally vocal about what they see as the great merit of the High Frontier proposals.

"Dan Graham and I first talked back in 1979," says Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., whose Congressional Space Caucus has studied the High Frontier program in detail, "and I quickly became convinced that he had two great insights.

"The first was that we could break out of the process of mutual [nuclear] suicide that we've been caught in for several decades. And the second was that we should compare [for military purposes] the control of space with the control of the air in the 20th century. And I think Dan Graham has been doing a superb job of suggesting how we might do both of these things."

President Reagan, meanwhile, has also expressed some early support for the kind of strategy outlined by High Frontier. As the president wrote to Graham last June 3: "You — and all those who have made the High Frontier project a reality — have rendered our country an invaluable service for which all future generations will be grateful."

Ambitious as it might at first sound, however, the military side of the High Frontier proposal actually amounts to only about half of

GRAHAM...Pg. 5-F